

1 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

3
4 **Wednesday, January 9, 2008**

5 **7:00 p.m.**

6 **Cottonwood Heights City Council Room**
7 **1265 East Fort Union Boulevard, Suite 300**
8 **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**
9

10 ***ATTENDANCE***

11
12 **Planning Commission Members:**

13
14 J. Thomas Bowen, Chairman
15 Geoff Armstrong
16 JoAnn Frost
17 Jerri Harwell, Alternate
18 Doug Haymore (excused at 7:55 p.m.)
19 Gordon Nicholl
20 Amy Rosevear, Alternate
21 Sue Ryser
22

12 **City Staff:**

13
14 Michael Black, Planning Director
15 Glenn Symes, Associate Planner
16 Shane Topham, City Attorney
17 Sherry McConkey, Planning Coordinator
18 Brad Gilson, City Engineer
19 Mayor Kelvyn Cullimore
20 Liane Stillman, City Manager
21 Sgt. Paul Brenneman
22 Detective Dan Bartlett
23

24 **Excused:**

25
26 Jim Keane
27

28 **REGULAR MEETING**

29
30 Chairman J. Thomas Bowen called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. The presence of Scout
31 Troop 1113 was acknowledged. The scouts were working on their communications merit badge.
32 Procedural issues were reviewed.
33

34 **1. Public Comment.**

35
36 There were no public comments.
37

38 **2. Continued Action Item – Conditional Use – Wasatch Office.**

39
40 (19:05:24) Chair Bowen reported that the Wasatch Office matter had been on the agenda several
41 times and had been continued from the Commission's December meeting for action tonight. The
42 item did not involve a public hearing. Additional public input had been received but the purpose
43 of tonight's meeting was for the Planning Commission to make a decision.
44

45 Chair Bowen reviewed what had transpired on the application. The property in question was
46 rezoned several years earlier by Salt Lake County. If the matter were presented to the City today

1 the rezone would most likely not be approved to the present zone. The City, however, was
2 obligated by law to deal with the property in its present state and zone. Chair Bowen explained
3 that by rezoning the property it was a given under state law that certain uses are appropriate.
4 Those uses were set out in the ordinance as conditional uses. State law requires that conditional
5 uses be granted in most instances unless there is some compelling interest in the property or
6 some detrimental effect that the use of the property will create that cannot be mitigated. He
7 explained that almost any use could be mitigated through some type of action.

8
9 Chair Bowen explained that the owner of the property upon filing an application, acquired
10 certain vested rights. The applicant had the right to see the application through and the City
11 could not deny that right. If those present were unhappy with the situation, he suggested their
12 concerns be addressed with the State Legislature. He remarked that cities receive their rights and
13 authority from the Legislature who can grant and take away certain rights from cities.
14 Approximately three years earlier, the Legislature enacted a law that substantially restricted the
15 ability of cities to deny conditional use permits. Given that background, the Commission tonight
16 was dealing with a property owner with certain vested rights who had made application. The
17 Commission was obligated under state law to deal with that and do what it can do to mitigate any
18 adverse impacts the property may have. The Commission's ability to deny a conditional use
19 application was severely limited.

20
21 (19:09:24) Chair Bowen stated that the City received a great deal of input from the public on the
22 matter. There were numerous public hearings conducted in an effort to try to communicate with
23 the citizens about what was taking place. Some of the information received from the public had
24 been very helpful. Some citizens thought the Commission was turning a deaf ear to what the
25 public had to say. That was not the case. The Commission appreciated the time and effort the
26 citizens had put in. The Commission Members thought that if the project were approved, it
27 would be much better because of the input received from concerned citizens and the neighbors in
28 the area. Chair Bowen thought the City had been quite diligent in dealing with the matter. The
29 Members of the Planning Commission reviewed all of the information submitted. He remarked
30 that the City had experts that it relied upon to help make recommendations.

31
32 Chair Bowen remarked that the matter was on the agenda the previous month. During that time
33 the Planning Commission was poised to make a decision but because of problems and materials
34 that were not received, the matter had to be continued. In the interim the developer filed a
35 request that a decision be rendered within 45 days. That request was filed in December. Both
36 sides had threatened to take legal action if the City failed to decide in their favor. The threat of
37 litigation was not something the City took lightly but it also was not something that intimidated
38 the Commission in making their decision. The charge of the Commission was to do their best
39 with the information available.

40
41 (19:13:36) Planning Director, Michael Black, showed slides of the site. He explained that the
42 applicant's request was consistent with the RM zoning designation granted to the property by
43 Salt Lake County. The request was for three office buildings totaling approximately 42,000
44 square feet. The property was described as approximately 5.12 acres of previously undeveloped
45 property at 7755 South Wasatch Boulevard. He noted that the site was covered with scrub oaks

1 and other trees. He estimated that one-third of the property was flat. He recognized that was
2 often overlooked since 65% of the property was sloped.

3
4 Mr. Black reported that the property was zoned RM by the County on March 9, 2004. There had
5 been some reports that the County did not follow proper procedure when noticing the public
6 hearing for the zone change. Because of that, the City conducted research after being
7 incorporated. Mr. Black reported that he actually conducted the research himself in June 2005.
8 He found that there was a well documented system in the file that showed that the County
9 followed its procedures for the rezone. A timeline of events pertaining to the request was kept.

10
11 Mr. Black discussed the role of the Planning Commission and explained that the Planning
12 Commission had the authority to make decisions regarding conditional uses, however, they are
13 required to follow the state and local codes. The state code says that the City shall approve a
14 conditional use if reasonable conditions are proposed or can be imposed to mitigate the
15 reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in order to deny a conditional use.
16 The Planning Commission must make a supported finding that the reasonably anticipated
17 detrimental effects of a proposed conditional use cannot be substantially mitigated by the
18 proposal or the imposition of reasonable conditions. The state does not expect or require that the
19 City eradicate detrimental effects; only that they mitigate them within reason.

20
21 (19:17:50) Mr. Black described the review process and stated that it took two years because of
22 the sensitive lands concerns on the project site. Staff began the review with the requirement that
23 the developer file a new application for conditional use with the City. The applicants had
24 previously applied for conditional use approval with the County, but before a final decision
25 could be made on the project, the City incorporated and the County closed the file without a
26 decision. After staff received a complete application, they began to look at the geology of the
27 site and required the developer to submit multiple reports and redo trenches to substantiate the
28 information they were providing. That process took over one year. Once the developer was able
29 to show that there were some buildable areas on the property, staff was able to move forward
30 with the remainder of the review. The site plan review entailed reviewing all points of the site
31 plan from grading to architecture and landscaping. The process also included a review by the
32 Architectural Review Commission. With the site plan review staff was able to propose
33 conditions to be imposed upon the developer and the development to mitigate the anticipated
34 detrimental effects. In total, 45 conditions were proposed.

35
36 The surrounding zoning in the area was described. Mr. Black displayed a table showing the total
37 impervious area of the site as 35%, including all of the building footprints and hard surfaces of
38 the site. It also showed that the formal and informal landscaped areas occupied about 65% of the
39 site. He explained that the Sensitive Lands Ordinance requires that no development in the
40 Sensitive Lands Zone have a total impermeable surface of more than 35% of the total property.

41
42 The site layout was discussed showing the buildings and their relationship to fault lines.
43 Mr. Black reported that there were fault lines on the property and many reports had been written
44 and trenches dug. He expected there would be more trenches dug when the buildings are
45 excavated. A rendering of the site showing the topography was displayed. With regard to

1 parking, Mr. Black stated that the City would have to enforce parking minimums. The maximum
2 for the medical uses would be 3.5 spaces per 1,000 net square feet of leasable floor area.

3
4 (19:23:48) With regard to landscaping, the City worked with the developer and his landscape
5 architect to arrive at the current landscape plan. The plan showed an increase in vegetation
6 around the site with new trees, native grasses, and annuals. There would be a healthy mix of
7 deciduous and evergreen trees throughout the development. The amount of new vegetation and
8 the existing vegetation to remain would be used to beautify the property and screen it from
9 adjacent uses. A great deal of the existing scrub oak was to be retained on site. The pedestrian
10 plan was described.

11
12 Architecture was reviewed. Mr. Black stated that the proposed architecture for the development
13 was designed to fit in as well as possible with the area. The Architectural Review Commission's
14 recommendations were included in the list of conditions provided to the Commission Members.
15 Lighting issues were reviewed. It was noted that all lights would be downward pointed and
16 adjustable.

17
18 Mr. Black stated that the proposed project was in the Sensitive Lands Area. The City Engineer
19 and City Geologist could attest to the fact that the applicants had met the conditions of those
20 areas.

21
22 Mr. Black read the following statement:

23
24 Throughout the development process, the City has tried to balance the property
25 rights of the landowner with the requests and demands of other parties. We also
26 have to be sure that they do not violate the state code or our own code in doing so.
27 We have operated within the code that is adopted and have processed the
28 applications accordingly. In some cases, we stepped outside of the state
29 requirements on our own and had more meetings than what is usually required or
30 thought to be adequate for a conditional use of this nature. All of these meetings
31 were held in an attempt to gain information from the public and to give information
32 to the public. The City has had seven public meetings, excluding Architectural
33 Review Commission Meetings and Development Review Commission Meetings.
34 Most conditional uses are justified with one public meeting or one public hearing.
35 With regard to the appropriateness of the land use, if this property owner came to
36 the City with a request for a zone change, the recommendation from staff would
37 have likely been much different. However, the City did not have the opportunity to
38 comment on that as zoning was approved before the City incorporated. The City
39 has had a policy not to do anything that would diminish any person's property
40 rights of values within the City. We processed the application with due diligence
41 and every condition being proposed today is one that was arrived at through a
42 thorough review of potential detrimental effects and staff is convinced that these
43 conditions will improve the project and better protect the neighborhood. We
44 understand that there are some people in the audience tonight who believe we, as
45 the staff, Planning Commission, and City Council have not done everything that we
46 could to protect them and their property rights. I have to say that I disagree and

1 that I personally have worked on the project for nearly three years, not for the
2 developer and not for myself, but representing the City's interests and those of the
3 area residents. I have done everything within my power and to the extent of the
4 law to review this project and proposed legal conditions and changes of the
5 development proposal that will be in the interest of preserving the health, safety,
6 and welfare of the City.
7

8 (19:32:25) The City Geologist reported that a series of studies were performed on the property.
9 Recommendations were made for additional information which was provided and reviewed. He
10 was in the process of making recommendations for final conditions when another geologist was
11 asked to review the property. He asked that additional work be done in order to confirm the
12 original findings. That work was done and taken into account and weighed against the standard
13 of practice with fault zones and end zones. The geologist came to the conclusion that sufficient
14 mitigation was done to make the proposed use of the property viable.
15

16 City Engineer, Brad Gilson, reported that Jason Davis, the UDOT Deputy Region Director, was
17 unable to attend tonight's meeting. With regard to traffic Mr. Gilson was asked to give a brief
18 overview of the applicant's access permit along Wasatch Boulevard. He stated that UDOT had
19 granted an access where they believed would be the best location. Other alternatives were
20 analyzed including Prospector Drive. No additional appreciable additional safety benefits were
21 provided. The additional counts represented only 14,000 cars per day and were far less than the
22 counts used in the studies. The traffic counts generated by the Wasatch Office Complex
23 represented a very small percentage of the total traffic on Wasatch Boulevard. UDOT indicated
24 that there were adequate opportunities to make a safe left hand movement with the current timing
25 of the two controlled signalized intersections. A resident raised an issue that the stretch of
26 roadway was classified by UDOT as a roadway requiring a signalized access. Any signalized
27 access for this type of classification would require one-half mile spacing per state law for a
28 signal. UDOT must grant an access by state law and as such, issued a number of significant
29 mitigating requirements as part of their permit. The access was also located on a flat portion of
30 Wasatch to preserve the maximum vertical site distance while allowing adequate spacing. In
31 their discussions with UDOT it was indicated that the access point was similar to hundreds of
32 other access points on high volume roadways throughout the valley.
33

34 (19:37:33) In response to a question raised, Mr. Gilson stated that UDOT spent a lot more time
35 with this particular access permit than they generally do with others. They spent a great deal of
36 time considering the site circumstance. It was suggested that UDOT apply an A through F
37 categorization for site location like they do for traffic failure based on how the area functions.
38

39 Commissioner Frost was not convinced with regard to the geology work. She had read a lot of
40 reports and could not understand why there were so many conflicting reports. Mr. Gilson stated
41 that there are often professional differences among geologists but on specifics he did not see a
42 pattern of things that were missed in the prior reports. There seemed to be a series of more and
43 more detailed work to reach a higher level of confidence. The later reports seemed to confirm
44 the prior reports.
45

1 Mr. Gilson explained that because there is a thick area of historic manmade fill that overlays a
2 very thick area of material, trenching more than 20 feet becomes problematic from a safety point
3 of view. He recommended there be verification in deep areas of sediment so that when
4 excavation is done for the buildings, there is digging across the building areas to reconfirm the
5 findings in the first few studies that there are no fault ruptures.

6
7 (19:43:29) *Commissioner Haymore moved that whereas the property has previously been*
8 *zoned and is currently zoned RM and whereas the facts seemed to have been exhaustively*
9 *reviewed and reasonable mitigating conditions can be imposed that he believed were addressed*
10 *in each instance by the staff report as printed, including the amendments and additions, that*
11 *the applicant's request for a conditional use be granted subject to the following conditions and*
12 *requirements:*

13
14 (**insert conditions here)

15
16 *The staff report shall include those changes and verbiage which would change the staff report*
17 *from suggestion to requirement and that the requirement for interior lighting to exterior*
18 *lighting as discussed in the work meeting be applicable. In addition, the additional condition*
19 *that was not published in the staff report but that was discussed previously regarding the*
20 *security of the parking lot during non-work hours be imposed.*

21
22 **

23 24 *Planning:*

25
26 *(changes referenced to the following conditions)*

27
28 2. *Exterior lighting shall cut off at 9:00 p.m.*

29
30 5. *The development shall designate snow stacking areas on the site plan and on site with*
31 *signage.*

32
33 20. *One four-inch caliper tree of a deciduous nature approved by staff will be required to*
34 *replace the box elder tree being removed due to Building 2's location.*

35
36 21. *Per this conditional use approval, the use for this property shall be limited to office,*
37 *business and/or professional medical, optical, or dental offices or laboratories.*

38
39 26.

40
41 27. *All on-site and off-site improvements shall be concluded before final occupancy is*
42 *granted for any buildings.*

43 44 *Engineering*

1 **9. *Provide utility crossings and profile and add flexible expansion joints where utilities***
2 ***cross false ____.***

3
4 ***Geologist Conditions:***

5
6 **3. *Excavate an additional trench in the area of Building 1 and Building 2 to a depth of 15***
7 ***to 20 feet to confirm the findings of the ____ 2004 and Western Geologic 2006 and***
8 ***2007 reports and the proposed locations of these buildings prior to issuance of building***
9 ***permit.***

10
11 ***Commissioner Rosevear seconded the motion.***

12
13 It was important to Commissioner Haymore that the motion include the preamble statements. If
14 the property was zoned R-1-8 and the Commission was asked to rezone it to RM he would not
15 support it under any circumstance. He would not be in favor of a zone change to RM for the
16 property and he thought it would be inappropriate based on many of the reasonings and public
17 policies for which the community chose to incorporate. Because the property was zoned RM, he
18 thought the developer with staff and the community had worked together to identify the
19 reasonably anticipated potential detrimental effects. Staff had also worked with the developer
20 and the community to impose reasonable mitigating conditions. He stated that the matter had
21 been exhaustively reviewed and he was impressed with the process and the input. While he
22 would not personally be in favor of a zone change, he thought the proposed project would be
23 very good because of the conditions placed on it.

24
25 Commissioner Frost stated that the Commission wanted the community's support for what was
26 being done in the City. She thought the issue was very conflicted. She believed the
27 Commission's responsibility was to the community first and to those who choose to change the
28 use of the community. She was concerned with the City's hillsides and planned to work to
29 secure them. She commended the community for the work they had done. She had questions on
30 the geology and was not comfortable with it. She did not feel mitigated as a Planning
31 Commissioner that the health, safety, and welfare of the community was being met with the
32 project.

33
34 Commissioner Ryser wished there could be this kind of community involvement on other issues.
35 She acknowledged that the issue had been a difficult one. She thought it was a good project but
36 not located in an ideal location. She did not feel good about the project but could not identify
37 any legal issues that would justify denial.

38
39 Commissioner Rosevear was comfortable with all of the recommendations received from the
40 professionals and supported staff's recommendation. In reading through the conditions, she
41 liked that the City had the right to re-review the project going forward. She thought the
42 Commission had done a good job of fulfilling their duty as described by the State Legislature.

43
44 (19:55:39) Commissioner Armstrong did not feel comfortable with the project. His major
45 concern was with the access onto Wasatch Boulevard. He realized that all of the legalities had
46 been complied with and he saw no justification to deny the project.

Commissioner Nicholl thought Commissioner Haymore's comments summed up his feelings on the project adequately. Chair Bowen agreed and stated that many asked that the Commission deny the request. He believed there was some sentiment that the Commission would like to do that, but legally there was no basis for it. Alternatively, conditions were imposed in an attempt to mitigate whatever adverse impact it might have on the neighborhood. He thought the Commission had done the best it could do. He appreciated the concerns and input from the citizens. The Commission tried to address those concerns and work with everyone in the process.

Vote on motion: Geoff Armstrong-Aye, JoAnn Frost-Nay, Doug Haymore-Aye, Gordon Nicholl-Aye, Amy Rosevear-Aye, Sue Ryser-Nay, J. Thomas Bowen-Aye. The motion passed. Alternate Jerri Harwell did not participate in the vote.

Commissioner Haymore was excused from the remainder of the meeting.

3. Public Hearing – Amendment to Title 12.20.060(j) Flag Lots Permitted – Wentworth Development.

(20:04:50) Associate Planner, Glenn Symes, reported that an application was received for a text amendment to the flag lot ordinance. The request initially was a change to the maximum stem length of 200 feet. Staff felt that was excessive and there would be a great deal involved in such a change. Staff spoke with the applicants and decided that 150 feet would be a better alternative. The ordinance was reviewed to make the changes necessary to increase the stem length. The proposed changes were provided to the Commission Members the previous Tuesday. Mr. Symes reported that the amendment was initiated by an applicant.

Chair Bowen opened the public hearing.

Developer Nate Fotheringham gave his address as 10714 South Jordan Gateway. He expressed appreciation to staff for their help. They had purchased a piece of property containing a dilapidated structure and were trying to figure out how it could be developed and improved. In the flag lot ordinance there was a 100-foot restriction on the driveway portion of the lot. One of the issues was that a minimum 8,000 square foot lot is required. The minimum lot width was 65 feet. If the driveway is required to be 100 feet with a width of 65 feet, there would only be 6,500 square feet remaining, which would not meet the code minimum for lot size. The second challenge was that it provides very difficult building lots where areas cannot be improved with homes that are livable. They looked at surrounding municipalities to become familiar with maximum lengths. Mr. Fotheringham asked for the Commission's consideration in making the proposed change.

There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Armstrong, Mr. Black explained that the 100 feet and the 12-foot width came from discussions with the Fire Department. Initially staff was satisfied with the 12-foot width as long as it was only 100 feet long. That would allow

1 emergency vehicles to park on the public street. Any driveway longer than 100 feet would
2 require an apparatus access down the driveway. That was the reasoning behind the wider width.
3 The fire turnaround would have to be 150 feet.

4
5 The requirements of neighboring cities were reviewed. Mr. Symes explained that at 100 feet the
6 stem would only need to be 17 feet wide rather than the full 20 plus the landscaping. Flag lot
7 issues were discussed.

8
9 (20:16:45) Chair Bowen suggested the matter be continued to allow staff to look at some of the
10 issues discussed to see if there was a way to resolve the situation. He was unsure whether it was
11 proper for the Commission to make a change just to accommodate a particular property owner.
12 Mr. Symes remarked that the applicants paid a \$1,200 fee to request the change.

13
14 Commissioner Nicholl stated that since he received the document the previous day he had been
15 in communication with Mr. Symes. He thought the request warranted more in-depth study.

16
17 (20:17:53) *Commissioner Nicholl moved to table the matter until the February 6 meeting.*
18 *Commissioner Frost seconded the motion.*

19
20 Mr. Fotheringham stated that they included the 200 feet in the application because they knew the
21 code change would affect the entire City. He did not think the modification should be directed at
22 their one lone development.

23
24 *Vote on motion: Geoff Armstrong-Aye, JoAnn Frost-Aye, Gordon Nicholl-Aye, Amy*
25 *Rosevear-Nay, Sue Ryser-Aye, J. Thomas Bowen-Aye. The motion passed. Commissioner*
26 *Haymore was not present for the vote. Alternate Jerri Harwell did not participate in the vote.*

27
28 **4. Public Hearing – Conditional Use Permit – Hyeongoo Kim.**

29
30 (20:20:05) Mr. Symes presented the staff report and stated that the applicant was requesting a
31 conditional use permit at 1525 East Fort Union Boulevard. The request was for an acupuncture
32 clinic, which fell under “clinic for health professionals” in the conditional uses in the
33 neighborhood commercial zone. The matter was noticed for a public hearing, but due to
34 scheduling conflicts, it still required approval from the Architectural Review Commission. Staff
35 felt the application met all of the requirements of the neighborhood commercial zone, the
36 conditional use ordinance, and the off-street parking ordinance. He proposed the Commission
37 defer approval to the Planning Director subject to approval of the Architectural Review
38 Commission.

39
40 Chair Bowen opened the public hearing.

41
42 (20:22:30) Bud Zirker gave his address as 6893 Cormorant Circle and remarked that the
43 proposed change would be to a property that is approximately 50 feet from their cul-de-sac
44 entrance. He wanted to know more about the parking issues. He had looked at the property and
45 unless it is completely raised and a new property built at the rear of the site, there was no way to
46 get parking either in front of or behind the present building. He stated that they may be able to

1 park four cars on the front off-street, but they could not get to the back of the property because
2 there is not enough room on either side. Mr. Zirker was present representing the 10 families on
3 Cormorant Circle. They did not want a business developed on the site that will impact their
4 circle. He envisioned cars parked on both sides of the street. The residents were opposed to any
5 action that would restrict parking on the site.

6
7 Mr. Symes acknowledged that parking was an issue on the site. As proposed, the site plan met
8 the off-street parking ordinance requirements. There was limited space which would limit the
9 usable space in the building. Under the adopted parking standards, 2 ½ parking stalls per 1,000
10 square feet were required.

11
12 Chair Bowen thought one of the conditions ought to be no parking on Cormorant Circle.
13 Mr. Symes agreed and recommended that the applicant explore a cross-access agreement or
14 shared parking agreement with the business next door. He explained that it would not be a
15 problem to add a condition prohibiting parking on Cormorant Circle but that it would be difficult
16 to require the applicants to obtain a cross-parking easement for more parking than what is needed
17 when they have already met the minimum. He explained that the applicants had more square
18 footage in the building than they would be using.

19
20 *(20:28:30) Commissioner Rosevear moved to delegate approval of the conditional use permit to*
21 *staff whereas the applicants have met all of the standards to receive the permit. Approval was*
22 *subject to endorsement by the Architectural Review Committee and the restriction on off-street*
23 *parking on Cormorant Circle. Commissioner Armstrong seconded the motion.*

24
25 Mr. Black informed concerned citizens that Kevin Smith at the City Offices could be contacted
26 about parking concerns. He commented that signage was not out of the question. Parking
27 requirements were discussed. Mr. Black suggested the Commission require three parking stalls
28 per 1,000 square feet plus three additional stalls for employees.

29
30 *Commissioner Rosevear withdrew her motion. Commissioner Armstrong withdrew his*
31 *second.*

32
33 *(20:35:40) Commissioner Rosevear moved to direct staff to provide the Commission with an*
34 *administrative interpretation of the minimum parking standard for the development and that a*
35 *decision be postponed on the application until a recommendation is received from the*
36 *Architectural Review Committee. Commissioner Frost seconded the motion. Vote on motion:*
37 *Geoff Armstrong-Aye, JoAnn Frost-Aye, Gordon Nicholl-Aye, Amy Rosevear-Aye, Sue Ryser-*
38 *Aye, J. Thomas Bowen-Aye. The motion passed. Commissioner Haymore was not present for*
39 *the vote. Alternate Jerri Harwell did not participate in the vote.*

40
41 **5. Discussion Item – Hand Out – Making Effective Public Comments: A Citizen's**
42 **Guide to the Public Process Regarding Planning Applications.**

43
44 Chair Bowen remarked that he edited the document and gave his suggestions to staff.
45 Commissioner _____ made other changes she agreed to email to Mr. Black. She thought

1 some of the language was technically correct but when considering that many of the people
2 reading it don't have the background, she thought it needed to be more layman-friendly.

3
4 Chair Bowen encouraged the Commission Members to submit recommended changes to
5 Mr. Black as soon as possible in an effort to get a final approval the following week.

6
7 **6. Approval of Minutes – December 5, 2007.**
8

9 (20:38:00) Chair Bowen had reviewed the minutes of October 3 and referenced page 8 where a
10 comment attributed to him was actually made by Don Machen.

11
12 Recommended modifications were made to the December 5 meeting.

13
14 (20:40:11) *Commissioner _____ moved to modify the October 3, 2007, minutes.*
15 *Commissioner _____ seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Geoff Armstrong-Aye,*
16 *JoAnn Frost-Aye, Gordon Nicholl-Aye, Amy Rosevear-Aye, Sue Ryser-Aye, J. Thomas*
17 *Bowen-Aye. The motion passed. Commissioner Haymore was not present for the vote.*
18 *Alternate Jerri Harwell did not participate in the vote.*

19
20 *Commissioner _____ moved to approve the December 5, 2007, minutes, as amended.*
21 *Commissioner _____ seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Geoff Armstrong-Aye, JoAnn*
22 *Frost-Aye, Gordon Nicholl-Aye, Amy Rosevear-Aye, Sue Ryser-Aye, J. Thomas Bowen-Aye.*
23 *The motion passed. Commissioner Haymore was not present for the vote. Alternate Jerri*
24 *Harwell did not participate in the vote.*

25
26 Commissioner Armstrong stated that he was misquoted in the October 17 minutes.

27
28 (20:41:24) *Commissioner _____ moved to approve the October 17 minutes as amended*
29 *by Commissioner Armstrong. Commissioner _____ seconded the motion. Vote on motion:*
30 *Geoff Armstrong-Aye, JoAnn Frost-Aye, Gordon Nicholl-Aye, Amy Rosevear-Aye, Sue Ryser-*
31 *Aye, J. Thomas Bowen-Aye. The motion passed. Commissioner Haymore was not present for*
32 *the vote. Alternate Jerri Harwell did not participate in the vote.*

33
34 **7. Action Item – 2008 Meeting Calendar.**
35

36 (20:40:29) Chair Bowen remarked that he made a mistake on the meeting calendar. He
37 explained that when the Commission approved the calendar they deleted the November 19
38 meeting scheduled the third Thursday in November. It was eliminated in 2007 because the third
39 Wednesday was the day before Thanksgiving. In November 2008, they did not have that
40 problem because of Leap Year. As a result, they were one week and one day away from
41 Thanksgiving. He suggested a meeting be held on November 19. Chair Bowen asked about the
42 scheduled December 17 meeting and asked if there should be two meetings in December. It was
43 decided that there would be one meeting in December.
44

1 **8. Planning Director's Report.**

2
3 There was no Planning Director's Report.

4
5 **9. Adjournment.**

6
7 *Commissioner Armstrong moved to adjourn. Commissioner Nicholl seconded the motion.*
8 *Vote on motion: Geoff Armstrong-Aye, JoAnn Frost-Aye, Gordon Nicholl-Aye, Amy*
9 *Rosevear-Aye, Sue Ryser-Aye, J. Thomas Bowen-Aye. The motion passed. Commissioner*
10 *Haymore was not present for the vote. Alternate Jerri Harwell did not participate in the vote.*

11
12 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*
2 *Cottonwood Heights City Planning Commission meeting held Wednesday, January 9, 2008.*
3
4
5

6
7 
8

9 Teri Forbes
10 T Forbes Group, Inc.
11 Minutes Secretary
12
13

14 Minutes approved: